

## REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 20, 2004 in which Claims 7, 9, 10, 37-40, 52, 53 and 61-63 were objected to and in which Claims 1-6, 8, 11-18, 34-36, 41-51, 54-60 and 64-70 were rejected. With this response, Claims 57-61 and 70 are cancelled and Claims 1, 8-11, 56, 64, 66 and 67 are amended. Claims 1-18, 34-56 and 62-69 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On September 29, 2004, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Valenza and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of independent Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) based upon Le Pham, U.S. Patent No. 6,530,658 was discussed. It was agreed upon that Le Pham '658 fails to disclose two separate and distinct webs or cleaning webs. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended accordingly to overcome the rejection based upon Le Pham '658.

The rejection of Claims 11, 64 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, was also discussed. Applicants agreed to amend Claim 9 to clarify that at least a portion of the span region carries a solvent. In essence, Claim 9 is intended to encompass a span of material carrying or bearing solvent, regardless of whether the entire roll has been pre-soaked with a solvent or whether the solvent is applied by a dispenser such as recited in dependent Claim 11.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Valenza for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for Examiner Valenza's suggestions for amending the claims to overcome the rejections.

### II. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 18, 34-36, 41-51, 54-60, 64-67, 69 and 70 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) Based Upon Le Pham '658.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 18, 34-36, 41-51, 54-60, 64-67, 69 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) as being anticipated by Le Pham, U.S. Patent No. 6,530,658. With this response, independent Claims 1 and

56 are amended while Claims 57-60 and 70 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 18, 34-36, 41-51, 54-56, 64-67 and 69, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Le Pham '658.

A. Claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for cleaning a transport belt. The method includes positioning a solvent-bearing cleaning web in non-contacting juxtaposition to a transport surface of the belt and positioning a dry cleaning web separate and distinct from the solvent-bearing cleaning web downstream of the solvent-bearing cleaning web in non-contacting juxtaposition to the transport surface of the belt. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on September 29, 2004, it was agreed upon that Le Pham '658 fails to disclose a solvent-bearing cleaning web and a dry cleaning web separate and distinct from the solvent-bearing cleaning web. In contrast, Le Pham '658 merely discloses a single continuous web having a solvent-bearing portion and a dry portion. Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, is believed to overcome the rejection based upon Le Pham '658. Claims 2-7 and Claims 34-55 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 8.

Claim 8 recites a transport belt cleaning apparatus which includes a first web means for wet cleaning and second web means separate and distinct from the first web means for dry cleaning an outer surface of a belt.

As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on September 29, 2004, it was agreed upon that Le Pham '658 fails to disclose separate and distinct webs for wet cleaning and dry cleaning of a belt surface. In contrast, Le Pham '658 merely discloses a single continuous web having portions for dry cleaning and wet cleaning. Accordingly, Claim 8, as amended, is believed to overcome the rejection based upon Le Pham '658. Claims 13, 14 and 18 depend from Claim 8 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

Claims 2-3, 6, 34-36, 41-51 and 54-55 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejections with respect to Le Pham '658 for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

III. Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 12, 15-17 and 68 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Le Pham '658.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejected Claims 4, 5, 12, 15-17 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Pham, U.S. Patent No. 6,530,658. Claims 4 and 5 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Claims 12 and 15-17 depend from Claim 8 and overcome the rejections for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 8.

IV. Rejection of Claims 11, 64 and 65 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected Claims 11, 64 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on September 29, 2004, Applicants agreed to amend Claim 9, from which Claim 11 depends, to clarify that at least a portion of the first span region carries the solvent while Claim 11 specifically claims that the solvent is applied by means for dispensing. With respect to Claim 56, from which Claims 64 and 65 depend, Applicants respectfully note that Claim 56 presently recites that the web bears or carries the solvent. Claim 56 is broad in that it does not require or limit the apparatus in how the solvent is initially deposited upon the web. In other words, Claim 56 is sufficiently broad to encompass the specific application of solvent by a pressure surface (Claims 64 and 65) or where the web is pre-soaked or pre-coated with solvent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 11, in light of the amendments to Claim 9, be withdrawn. Applicants further respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 64 and 65, in light of the above remarks, be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-18, 34-56 and 62-69 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 8, 2004

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22879  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276